

# Internet Appendix - Family Comes First: Reproductive Health and the Gender Gap in Entrepreneurship

Jonathan Zandberg\*

Boston College, the Carroll School of Management

---

\*Author at: Boston College the Carroll School of Management, 140 Commonwealth Avenue, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467; E-mail address: zandberg@bc.edu

Table I.1: **Entrepreneurship and abortion ratios among employed individuals - ACS data 2001-2017**

The table shows an LPM regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database between the years 2001 and 2017. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to employed individuals with college degrees to better differentiate between small business owners and growth-seeking entrepreneurs. *Abortion ratio* are abortions as a percentage of pregnancies excluding fetal deaths/miscarriages. Regression (1) looks at a subsample of employed women between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States; regression (2) controls for marital status, ethnicity, log number of children, a dummy variable of whether the individual has children in household, state GDP growth, state personal income growth, and the fractions of Republicans in the Senate; regression (3) limits the sample to individuals with no children; regression (4) limits the sample to individuals with children; regression (5) limits the sample to men age 20 to 40 as a placebo group; and regression (6) limits the sample to women above 40 as a second placebo group. Standard errors are clustered at the state  $\times$  year level.

Variables	Treated Group: Employed women 20-40				Placebo group	
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) No children	(4) Children	(5) Men 20-40	(6) Women >40
Abortion ratio	0.0114* (0.00590)	0.0128** (0.00612)	0.0135** (0.00536)	0.0122 (0.0120)	0.00672 (0.00870)	0.000672 (0.00775)
Married		0.00651*** (0.000322)	0.00466*** (0.000349)	0.00948*** (0.000592)	0.00608*** (0.000564)	0.0116*** (0.000364)
Minorities		-0.00116*** (0.000341)	-0.000619 (0.000405)	-0.00153*** (0.000566)	-0.00720*** (0.000556)	-0.00154*** (0.000452)
Ln(#children+1)		0.00889*** (0.000933)		0.00846*** (0.000968)	0.0186*** (0.00135)	0.00883*** (0.000939)
Has children		-0.00649*** (0.000910)			-0.0100*** (0.00141)	-0.00693*** (0.000908)
State GDP growth		-0.00764 (0.0206)	-0.0293 (0.0214)	0.0127 (0.0348)	0.0384 (0.0344)	-0.0438 (0.0266)
Personal inc. growth		-0.00115 (0.0110)	0.00445 (0.0118)	-0.00500 (0.0197)	-0.0259 (0.0175)	0.0236 (0.0150)
Frac. republicans		-0.000513 (0.000823)	-0.000787 (0.000778)	-0.000408 (0.00134)	0.000148 (0.00120)	0.000540 (0.000989)
Observations	1,482,199	1,472,141	797,932	674,209	1,198,787	1,927,612
R-squared	0.036	0.037	0.027	0.047	0.066	0.066
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.2: **Entrepreneurship and abortion ratios, Probit model - ACS data 2001-2016**

The table shows a Probit regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database between the years 2001 and 2017. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to individuals with college degrees to better differentiate between small business owners and growth-seeking entrepreneurs. *Abortion ratio* are abortions as percentage of pregnancies excluding fetal deaths/miscarriages. Regression: (1) looks at a subsample of individuals between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States; (2) adds controls (3) limits the sample to individuals with no children; (4) limits the sample to individuals with children; (5) limits the sample to a placebo group of individuals above 40. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	Treated group: All individuals 20-40				Placebo
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) No children	(4) Children	(5) Age>40
Female X Abortion ratio	0.246** (0.108)	0.257** (0.110)	0.273 (0.186)	0.286 (0.186)	-0.186** (0.0738)
Female	-0.562*** (0.0265)	-0.545*** (0.0348)	-0.441*** (0.0601)	-0.634*** (0.0528)	-0.509*** (0.0188)
Abortion ratio	0.102 (0.172)	0.129 (0.167)	0.285** (0.132)	-0.0195 (0.212)	0.191** (0.0859)
Observations	2,806,033	2,787,263	1,543,865	1,243,398	4,373,203
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.3: **Entrepreneurship and abortion ratios, Logit model - ACS data 2001-2016**

The table shows a Logit regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database between the years 2001 and 2017. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to individuals with college degrees to better differentiate between small business owners and growth-seeking entrepreneurs. *Abortion ratio* are abortions as percentage of pregnancies excluding fetal deaths/miscarriages. Regression: (1) looks at a subsample of individuals between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States; (2) adds controls (3) limits the sample to individuals with no children; (4) limits the sample to individuals with children; (5) limits the sample to a placebo group of individuals above 40. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	Treated group: All individuals 20-40				Placebo
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) No children	(4) Children	(5) Age>40
Female X Abortion ratio	0.663** (0.283)	0.695** (0.280)	0.816* (0.471)	0.696 (0.483)	-0.391** (0.172)
Female	-1.363*** (0.0666)	-1.378*** (0.0877)	-1.152*** (0.151)	-1.558*** (0.126)	-1.173*** (0.0448)
Abortion ratio	0.233 (0.389)	0.275 (0.381)	0.670** (0.310)	-0.0393 (0.456)	0.386** (0.174)
Observations	2,806,033	2,787,263	1,543,865	1,243,398	4,373,203
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.4: **Entrepreneurship and number of abortion providers - ACS data 2005-2014**

The table shows an LPM regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database for the years 2005, 2008, 2011 and 2014 as published by the Guttmacher Institute. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to individuals with college degrees to better differentiate between small business owners and growth-seeking entrepreneurs.  $\ln(\# \text{ of providers})$  is the natural logarithm of the number of places per million residents that provided abortion services in each state. Regression: (1) looks at the entire population of women between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States; (2) controls for marital status, ethnicity, log number of children, a dummy variable of whether the individual has children in household, state GDP growth, state personal income growth, and the fractions of Republicans in the Senate; (3) limits the sample to individuals with no children; (4) limits the sample to individuals with children; (5) limits the sample to men age 20 to 40 as a placebo group; (6) limits the sample to women above 40 as a second placebo group. Standard errors are clustered at the state $\times$ year level.

Variables	Treated group: Women 20-40				Placebo group	
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) No children	(4) Children	(5) Men 20-40	(6) Women>40
Ln(# of providers)	0.0109*** (0.00385)	0.0119*** (0.00385)	0.0148*** (0.00449)	0.0104* (0.00541)	0.0129 (0.00802)	0.00493 (0.00374)
Married		0.00641*** (0.000605)	0.00448*** (0.000683)	0.00959*** (0.000972)	0.00398*** (0.00106)	0.00933*** (0.000490)
Minorities		-0.000512 (0.000520)	-0.000586 (0.000657)	-0.000875 (0.000834)	-0.00672*** (0.000806)	-0.000985 (0.000658)
Ln(#children+1)		0.00902*** (0.00165)		0.00977*** (0.00176)	0.0192*** (0.00219)	0.0102*** (0.00164)
Has children		-0.00721*** (0.00163)			-0.00875*** (0.00218)	-0.00659*** (0.00155)
State GDP growth		0.0225 (0.0327)	-0.0314 (0.0398)	0.0754 (0.0566)	0.113* (0.0588)	-0.0847** (0.0360)
Personal inc. growth		-0.0326** (0.0153)	-0.0150 (0.0187)	-0.0522* (0.0300)	-0.0287 (0.0309)	0.00685 (0.0229)
Frac. republicans		-0.000543 (0.00108)	-0.000919 (0.00153)	-0.000284 (0.00169)	-0.00333* (0.00191)	0.00106 (0.00124)
Observations	493,378	490,463	258,368	232,095	380,608	802,017
R-squared	0.037	0.038	0.028	0.052	0.068	0.074
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.5: **Entrepreneurship and pregnancies receiving late or no prenatal care - ACS 2001-2013**

The table shows an LPM regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database between the years 2001 and 2013. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to individuals with college degrees to better differentiate between small business owners and growth-seeking entrepreneurs. *Late or no prenatal care* variable measures the percentage of women receiving prenatal care only during their third trimester or not receiving care at all. Data on prenatal care are collected from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics, the "Monthly Vital Statistics Report." The choice of years is due to the availability of this measure. Regression: (1) looks at the entire population of women between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States; (2) controls for marital status, ethnicity, log number of children, a dummy variable of whether the individual has children in household, state GDP growth, state personal income growth, and the fractions of Republicans in the Senate; (3) limits the sample to individuals with no children; (4) limits the sample to individuals with children; (5) limits the sample to men age 20 to 40 as a placebo group; (6) limits the sample to women above 40 as a second placebo group. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	Treated group: Women 20-40				Placebo group	
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) No children	(4) Children	(5) Men 20-40	(6) Women>40
Late/No prenatal care	-0.0516** (0.0220)	-0.0529** (0.0221)	-0.0550** (0.0240)	-0.0654** (0.0321)	-0.0509 (0.0418)	-0.0163 (0.0213)
Married		0.00611*** (0.000441)	0.00451*** (0.000457)	0.00868*** (0.000809)	0.00611*** (0.000755)	0.00836*** (0.000362)
Minorities		-0.000402 (0.000453)	-0.000244 (0.000529)	-0.000863 (0.000702)	-0.00730*** (0.000759)	-0.00126** (0.000499)
Ln(#children+1)		0.00661*** (0.00120)		0.00756*** (0.00126)	0.0204*** (0.00176)	0.00798*** (0.00105)
Has children		-0.00502*** (0.00116)			-0.0117*** (0.00189)	-0.00541*** (0.00101)
State GDP growth		0.000854 (0.0272)	-0.0465 (0.0296)	0.0529 (0.0435)	0.0782 (0.0507)	-0.0347 (0.0283)
Personal inc. growth		0.0125 (0.0133)	-0.00148 (0.0162)	0.0294 (0.0241)	-0.0141 (0.0231)	0.00722 (0.0157)
Frac. republicans		-0.000247 (0.00113)	-0.000159 (0.00101)	-0.000724 (0.00191)	0.00268* (0.00149)	-0.000209 (0.00110)
Observations	827,399	820,767	433,391	387,376	645,102	1,288,349
R-squared	0.036	0.037	0.028	0.048	0.068	0.071
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.6: **Top 20 industry classifications of women entrepreneurs - LPM - ACS data 2001-2017**

The table shows the top twenty industry classifications of women entrepreneurs, ages 20 to 40 with college degrees. Column (1) reports the 1990 Census Industry Classification; (2) reports the industry's description; (3) reports the number of individuals in my sample multiplied by their weight giving the estimated number of women in those industries in the population; column (3) reports their relative frequency to all women entrepreneurs in the sample of women ages 20 to 40 with college degrees; and column (5) reports the coefficient and standard error of the variable *Abortion ratio* in the baseline regression (Eq. 1) when excluding this industry.

Code	Description	Frequency	%	Coefficient
712	real estate, including real estate-insurance offices	198,068	5.9%	0.0120** (0.00537)
892	management and public relations services	196,938	5.9%	0.0112** (0.00544)
840	health services	187,020	5.6%	0.0122** (0.00579)
741	business services	160,435	4.8%	0.0103* (0.00528)
841	legal services	152,657	4.6%	0.0121** (0.00559)
641	eating and drinking places	148,167	4.4%	0.0118** (0.00565)
791	miscellaneous personal services	136,009	4.1%	0.0118** (0.00570)
812	offices and clinics of physicians	123,604	3.7%	0.0107** (0.00547)
060	all construction	112,271	3.4%	0.0129** (0.00542)
860	educational services	97,862	2.9%	0.0119** (0.00558)
732	computer and data processing	94,554	2.8%	0.0126** (0.00580)
893	miscellaneous professional and related services	91,853	2.8%	0.0119** (0.00554)
820	offices and clinics of dentists	91,071	2.7%	0.0110** (0.00550)
810	miscellaneous entertainment	79,480	2.4%	0.0115** (0.00585)
862	child day care services	70,051	2.1%	0.0109* (0.00557)
890	accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services	69,706	2.1%	0.0109** (0.00557)
721	advertising	56,803	1.7%	0.0106* (0.00550)
623	apparel and accessory stores, except shoe	50,741	1.5%	0.0119** (0.00570)
682	miscellaneous retail stores	50,383	1.5%	0.0120** (0.00553)
711	insurance	49,770	1.5%	0.0109* (0.00570)

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.7: **Top 20 industry classifications of women entrepreneurs - Roe v. Wade analysis - CPS data 1970-1980**

The table shows the top twenty industry classifications of women entrepreneurs, ages 20 to 40 with college degrees around Roe v. Wade. Column (1) reports the 1990 Census Industry Classification; (2) reports the industry's description; (3) reports the number of individuals in my sample multiplied by their weight giving the estimated number of women in those industries in the population; column (4) reports their relative frequency to all women entrepreneurs in the sample of women ages 20 to 40 with college degrees; and column (5) reports the coefficient and standard error of the triple interaction *Female x Treated x Post* in a regression (Eq. 4) that excludes this industry.

Code	Description	Frequency	%	Coefficient
860	educational services	256,407	17.0%	0.0150*** (0.00448)
893	miscellaneous professional and related services	154,932	10.3%	0.0173*** (0.00474)
770	lodging places, except hotels and motels	117,076	7.8%	0.0148*** (0.00485)
682	miscellaneous retail stores	78,789	5.2%	0.0179*** (0.00507)
671	direct selling establishments	73,888	4.9%	0.0172*** (0.00496)
712	real estate, including real estate-insurance offices	70,076	4.6%	0.0163*** (0.00494)
840	health services	68,449	4.5%	0.0176*** (0.00429)
892	management and public relations services	64,154	4.3%	0.0176*** (0.00474)
842	elementary and secondary schools	45,966	3.0%	0.0206*** (0.00658)
010	agricultural production, crops	37,878	2.5%	0.0172*** (0.00495)
741	business services	33,752	2.2%	0.0168*** (0.00499)
810	miscellaneous entertainment and recreation services	31,543	2.1%	0.0175*** (0.00488)
800	theaters and motion pictures	26,569	1.8%	0.0182*** (0.00502)
631	furniture and home furnishings stores	24,767	1.6%	0.0168*** (0.00535)
761	private households	24,708	1.6%	0.0166*** (0.00503)
641	eating and drinking places	24,042	1.6%	0.0173*** (0.00490)
841	legal services	22,144	1.5%	0.0177*** (0.00477)
812	offices and clinics of physicians	21,835	1.4%	0.0162*** (0.00470)
890	accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services	21,399	1.4%	0.0162*** (0.00550)
623	apparel and accessory stores, except shoe	20,773	1.4%	0.0166*** (0.00500)

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.*



Table I.8: **Top 20 industry classifications of women entrepreneurs - TRAP laws analysis - CPS data 1977-2008**

The table shows the top twenty industry classifications of women entrepreneurs, ages 20 to 40 with college degrees replicating the TRAP laws analysis between 1977 and 2008. Column (1) reports the 1990 Census Industry Classification; (2) reports the industry's description; (3) reports the number of individuals in my sample multiplied by their weight giving the estimated number of women in those industries in the population; column (3) reports their relative frequency to all women entrepreneurs in the sample of women ages 20 to 40 with college degrees; and column (5) reports the coefficient and standard error of the triple interaction *Treated* in a regression (Eq. 8) that excludes this industry.

Code	Description	Frequency	%	Coefficient
741	business services	1,139,022	7.6%	-0.00452** (0.00224)
860	educational services	0,821,724	5.5%	-0.00378* (0.00216)
892	management and public relations services	0,755,164	5.0%	-0.00469** (0.00206)
893	miscellaneous professional and related services	0,738,198	4.9%	-0.00375* (0.00199)
712	real estate, including real estate-insurance offices	0,679,219	4.5%	-0.00494** (0.00209)
671	direct selling establishments	0,669,828	4.5%	-0.00424** (0.00211)
841	legal services	0,524,840	3.5%	-0.00350* (0.00199)
810	miscellaneous entertainment and recreation services	0,418,786	2.8%	-0.00302 (0.00213)
840	health services	0,418,506	2.8%	-0.00407* (0.00221)
862	child day care services	0,407,595	2.7%	-0.00397* (0.00210)
890	accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services	0,396,792	2.6%	-0.00341 (0.00243)
641	eating and drinking places	0,352,673	2.3%	-0.00454** (0.00204)
800	theaters and motion pictures	0,342,323	2.3%	-0.00417** (0.00204)
812	offices and clinics of physicians	0,338,637	2.3%	-0.00382** (0.00188)
791	miscellaneous personal services	0,336,342	2.2%	-0.00394* (0.00223)
770	lodging places, except hotels and motels	0,330,228	2.2%	-0.00411* (0.00221)
732	computer and data processing services	0,320,560	2.1%	-0.00413* (0.00217)
682	miscellaneous retail stores	0,291,914	1.9%	-0.00311 (0.00199)
830	offices and clinics of health practitioners	0,288,425	1.9%	-0.00434** (0.00199)
863	family child care homes	0,285,547	1.9%	-0.00411* (0.00212)

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.9: **Top 20 industry classifications of women entrepreneurs - weighted index analysis - ACS data 2001-2017**

The table shows the top twenty industry classifications of women entrepreneurs, ages 20 to 40 with college degrees. Column (1) reports the 1990 Census Industry Classification; (2) reports the industry's description; (3) reports the number of individuals in my sample multiplied by their weight giving the estimated number of women in those industries in the population; column (3) reports their relative frequency to all women entrepreneurs in the sample of women ages 20 to 40 with college degrees; and column (5) reports the coefficient and standard error of the interaction *Female x Access index* in the baseline regression (Eq. 11) when excluding this industry.

Code	Description	Frequency	%	Coefficient
712	real estate, including real estate-insurance offices	198,068	5.9%	0.000976*** (0.000279)
892	management and public relations services	196,938	5.9%	0.000956*** (0.000265)
840	health services	187,020	5.6%	0.000923*** (0.000275)
741	business services	160,435	4.8%	0.00100*** (0.000280)
841	legal services	152,657	4.6%	0.000782*** (0.000269)
641	eating and drinking places	148,167	4.4%	0.000999*** (0.000284)
791	miscellaneous personal services	136,009	4.1%	0.00105*** (0.000283)
812	offices and clinics of physicians	123,604	3.7%	0.000832*** (0.000273)
060	all construction	112,271	3.4%	0.000876*** (0.000270)
860	educational services	97,862	2.9%	0.00102*** (0.000282)
732	computer and data processing	94,554	2.8%	0.000957*** (0.000275)
893	miscellaneous professional and related services	91,853	2.8%	0.00109*** (0.000272)
820	offices and clinics of dentists	91,071	2.7%	0.000916*** (0.000276)
810	miscellaneous entertainment	79,480	2.4%	0.00102*** (0.000281)
862	child day care services	70,051	2.1%	0.000952*** (0.000280)
890	accounting, auditing, and bookkeeping services	69,706	2.1%	0.000966*** (0.000283)
721	advertising	56,803	1.7%	0.00101*** (0.000280)
623	apparel and accessory stores, except shoe	50,741	1.5%	0.00101*** (0.000284)
682	miscellaneous retail stores	50,383	1.5%	0.0102*** (0.000277)
711	insurance	49,770	1.5%	0.000913*** (0.000278)

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.10: **Abortion ratios, number of providers, and prenatal care tested on placebo professions - ACS data 2001-2017**

The table shows the coefficient of interest from a set of eighteen separate LPM regressions (Placebo group) in which the left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, was replaced by a set of various professions. Each coefficient is derived from a separate regression with a set of controls and state, year, age, and industry fixed effects. The regressions in the first row are equivalent to the one in column (2) Table I.1, the regressions in the second row are equivalent to the one in column (2) Table I.4 and the regressions in the third row are equivalent to the one in column (2) Table I.5. The original coefficients are reported in column (1) for comparison.

Variable	Treated Group	Placebo group					
	(1) Entrepreneur	(2) Banker	(3) Lawyer	(4) Architect	(5) Physician	(6) Engineer	(7) Entertainer
Abortion ratio	0.0118** (0.00565)	-0.00164 (0.00288)	0.00679*** (0.00246)	0.00123 (0.00130)	0.000249 (0.00299)	0.00178 (0.00114)	0.000249 (0.00299)
Ln(# of providers)	0.0119*** (0.00385)	0.0067 (0.0140)	0.0114 (0.0138)	-0.00686 (0.00766)	0.0102 (0.0167)	-0.00663 (0.00498)	0.0102 (0.0167)
Prenatal care	-0.0529** (0.0221)	0.0618 (0.152)	-0.239 (0.273)	-0.0728 (0.0515)	0.0450 (0.137)	0.00445 (0.0564)	0.0450 (0.137)

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.11: **Difference-in-differences among employed and unemployed individuals  
- CPS data 1970-1980**

A difference-in-differences analysis around the January 1973 *Roe v. Wade* court decision. The weighted subsample consists of all employed, self-employed and unemployed, college graduate, individuals representing the same population in the United States. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed in a nonfarm profession. Control states are states that legalized abortions in 1970: AK, CA, HI, NY, WA. Treated states are the rest of the states that legalized abortions following the court's decision in 1973. Control variables include marital status, ethnicity, and number of children. State level controls were dropped due to grouping of some of the states in the early 70s surveys. *Female X Treated X Post Roe* measures the marginal effect of the legalization of abortions on women in the seven years following the court's decision. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	(1) Base	(2) Controls	(3) Year FE	(4) State FE	(5) Age FE	(6) Industry FE	(7) All FE
Female x Treated x Post	0.0172*** (0.00435)	0.0164*** (0.00433)	0.0163*** (0.00436)	0.0163*** (0.00435)	0.0164*** (0.00455)	0.0146*** (0.00376)	0.0146*** (0.00376)
Female x Treated	0.00331 (0.0139)	0.00501 (0.0138)	0.00504 (0.0138)	0.00470 (0.0138)	0.00482 (0.0139)	0.00568 (0.0110)	0.00525 (0.0113)
Female x Post	-0.0148*** (0.00249)	-0.0146*** (0.00246)	-0.0146*** (0.00249)	-0.0143*** (0.00244)	-0.0146*** (0.00287)	-0.0130*** (0.00226)	-0.0120*** (0.00219)
Treat x Post	-0.0126*** (0.00399)	-0.0134*** (0.00402)	-0.0131*** (0.00388)	-0.0147*** (0.00444)	-0.0132*** (0.00377)	-0.00944*** (0.00329)	-0.00861** (0.00351)
Female	-0.0384*** (0.0133)	-0.0388*** (0.0132)	-0.0388*** (0.0132)	-0.0387*** (0.0132)	-0.0353*** (0.0132)	-0.0219** (0.00997)	-0.0208** (0.0101)
Treated	-0.00830 (0.0143)	-0.0106 (0.0140)	-0.0108 (0.0140)		-0.00737 (0.0137)	-0.00599 (0.0107)	
Post	0.0209*** (0.00142)	0.0244*** (0.00167)		0.0234*** (0.00172)	0.0197*** (0.00104)	0.0142*** (0.00131)	
Observations	97,017	97,017	97,017	97,017	97,017	97,017	97,017
R-squared	0.009	0.015	0.015	0.018	0.022	0.186	0.193
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
State FE	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Age FE	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Industry FE	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.12: **Dynamic difference-in-differences among employed and unemployed individuals - CPS data 1968-1980**

A dynamic difference-in-differences analysis. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed and in a nonfarm profession. The dummy variable *Treatment* turns into one in 1970 for: AK, CA, HI, NY, WA and in 1973 for the rest. The weighted target group consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, women, the first placebo group consists of all college graduate men in the same age group and the second placebo group consists of all college graduate women above 40. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	Treated: Women 20-40		Placebo	
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) Men 20-40	(4) Women >40
Treatment	0.00675*** (0.00213)	0.00616*** (0.00219)	-0.00561 (0.00337)	-0.00570 (0.00504)
Married		0.00385** (0.00160)	0.00214 (0.00297)	0.000741 (0.00310)
Minorities		-0.00895*** (0.00261)	-0.00997** (0.00390)	-0.0107** (0.00471)
Ln(#children+1)		0.00669 (0.00437)	0.00736 (0.00527)	0.0147** (0.00557)
Has children		0.0110** (0.00500)	-0.0101 (0.00628)	-0.0138** (0.00587)
Observations	47,906	47,906	61,863	33,372
R-squared	0.194	0.196	0.232	0.260
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
state FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.13: **Dynamic difference-in-differences among employed and unemployed individuals around the 1970 legalization of abortions and the 1973 Roe v. Wade ruling - testing for pre-trends - CPS data 1968-1980**

A dynamic difference-in-differences analysis of the combined data set. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. *PreTrend* is a dummy variable that turns into one the year before abortions were legal in each state (1969 for: AK, CA, HI, NY, WA and 1972 for the rest) and turns back into zero the following year. *Treatment* is a dummy variable that turns into one the year abortions were legal and back into zero a year later. *Post Treatment* is a dummy variable that captures the long run effect by turning into one the year after treatment and staying one until the last year of the sample. The sample consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, men and women. Regression (1) consists of a subsample of employed and self-employed individuals and no controls; (2) is the same regression on all individuals, including unemployed; (3) is the same regression as regression one but with controls and (4) is the same as regression three but on all individuals including unemployed. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	(1) Employed only	(2) All individuals	(3) Employed only	(4) All individuals
Female X PostTreatment	0.0268** (0.0121)	0.0194** (0.00912)	0.0239** (0.0110)	0.0183** (0.00854)
Female X Treatment	0.0157 (0.0104)	0.00949 (0.00802)	0.0135 (0.00993)	0.00956 (0.00757)
Female X PreTrend	0.00404 (0.00723)	0.00447 (0.00669)	0.00340 (0.00810)	0.00410 (0.00715)
Observations	64,348	77,032	64,348	77,032
R-squared	0.013	0.015	0.022	0.021
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
state FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.14: **TRAP physical plant/personnel requirements by year enacted**

The year each state enacted a TRAP physical plant/personnel requirements as reported on Medoff (2010).

State	Year Enacted
Alabama	2002
Arizona	1999
Arkansas	1999
Florida	1999
Illinois	1985
Indiana	2005
Kentucky	1998
Louisiana	2003
Michigan	1978
Mississippi	1991
Missouri	1987
North Carolina	1998
Oklahoma	1998
Pennsylvania	1999
South Carolina	1996
Tennessee	1989
Texas	1997
Utah	1981

Table I.15: **Dynamic difference-in-differences among employed and unemployed individuals - TRAP laws - CPS data 1977-2008**

A dynamic difference-in-differences analysis. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed in a nonfarm profession. The dummy variable *TRAP law treatment* turns into one once TRAP laws are enacted in each state. The weighted target group consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate women, the first placebo group consists of all college graduate men in the same age group and the second placebo group consists of all college graduate women above 40. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	Treated: Women 20-40		Placebo	
	(1) No controls	(2) Controls	(3) Men 20-40	(4) Women >40
TRAP law treatment	-0.00351** (0.00172)	-0.00360** (0.00176)	0.00369 (0.00483)	0.000628 (0.00225)
Married		0.0136*** (0.00129)	0.00430** (0.00194)	0.0167*** (0.00159)
Minorities		-0.00622** (0.00247)	-0.0121*** (0.00245)	-0.00295* (0.00171)
Ln(#children+1)		0.0176*** (0.00268)	0.00785** (0.00326)	0.0119*** (0.00418)
Has children		-0.00259 (0.00290)	-0.00282 (0.00324)	-0.0108*** (0.00347)
Observations	205,780	205,780	200,555	190,101
R-squared	0.231	0.233	0.191	0.342
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
state FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*



Table I.16: **Dynamic difference-in-differences among employed and unemployed individuals with gender interaction, testing for pretrends, TRAP laws - CPS data 1977-2008**

A dynamic difference-in-differences analysis of the combined data set. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed in a nonfarm profession. *PreTRAP laws* is a dummy variable that turns into one the year before TRAP laws were enacted in each state (e.g. 2001 for AL, 1998 for AZ, and 2004 for IN) and turns back into zero the following year. *Treatment* is a dummy variable that turns into one the year TRAP laws were enacted and back into zero a year later. *Post Treatment* is a dummy variable that captures the long run effect by turning into one the year after treatment and staying one until the last year of the sample. The sample consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, men and women. Regression (1) consists of a subsample of employed and self-employed individuals; (2) is the same regression on all individuals, including unemployed; (3) is the same regression as regression one but with controls and (4) is the same as regression three but on all individuals including unemployed. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	(1) Employed only	(2) All individuals	(3) Employed only	(4) All individuals
Female X PostTRAP laws	-0.00961* (0.00531)	-0.00859* (0.00502)	-0.00940* (0.00523)	-0.00861* (0.00502)
Female X Treatment TRAP laws	0.00316 (0.0133)	0.00278 (0.0123)	0.00396 (0.0132)	0.00295 (0.0121)
Female X PreTRAP laws	-0.00733 (0.00951)	-0.00447 (0.00856)	-0.00681 (0.00954)	-0.00393 (0.00845)
Observations	332,362	370,888	325,873	363,751
R-squared	0.010	0.011	0.019	0.018
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
state FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.17: **Entrepreneurship and unweighted access index among employed and unemployed individuals with gender interaction - ACS data 2006-2017**

A weighted least square regressions of a dummy variable equals to one when the individual is an entrepreneur against the interaction between a dummy variable equals one when the individual is a female multiplied by that year-state standardized “Access index”. *Access index* tracks state legislation that improves or weakens access to reproductive care. Higher index means better access. The sample consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, men and women. Regression (1) uses a subsample of employed individuals and no controls; (2) is the same as one on the entire population - employed, self-employed, and unemployed; (3) is the same regression as regression one but controls for marital status, ethnicity, number of children, state GDP growth, state personal income growth, and the fractions of Republicans in the Senate; (4) is the same as regression three on all, employed, self-employed and unemployed individuals. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	(1) Employed only	(2) All individuals	(3) Employed only	(4) All individuals
Female x Access index	0.000745*** (0.000271)	0.000807*** (0.000266)	0.000703*** (0.000272)	0.000767*** (0.000267)
Female	-0.0131*** (0.000285)	-0.0131*** (0.000277)	-0.0135*** (0.000290)	-0.0137*** (0.000283)
Access index	0.000849 (0.000525)	0.000741 (0.000499)	0.00107** (0.000536)	0.000954* (0.000509)
Married			0.00672*** (0.000307)	0.00662*** (0.000297)
Minorities			-0.00397*** (0.000284)	-0.00328*** (0.000266)
Ln(#children+1)			0.0127*** (0.000845)	0.0106*** (0.000777)
Has children			-0.00718*** (0.000823)	-0.00547*** (0.000763)
State GDP growth			-0.00276 (0.0197)	-0.00255 (0.0189)
Personal inc. growth			-0.0189* (0.0108)	-0.0187* (0.0103)
Frac. republicans			-0.000337 (0.000911)	-0.000325 (0.000872)
Observations	2,632,393	2,754,593	2,615,054	2,736,922
R-squared	0.047	0.048	0.049	0.049
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.18: **Entrepreneurship and weighted access index among employed and unemployed individuals with gender interaction and state×year fixed effects - ACS data 2006-2017**

A weighted least square regressions of a dummy variable equals to one when the individual is an entrepreneur against the interaction between a dummy variable equals one when the individual is a female multiplied by that year-state standardized “Access index”. *Access index* tracks state legislation that improves or weakens access to reproductive care. Higher index means better access. The sample consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, men and women. Regression (1) uses a subsample of employed individuals and no controls; (2) is the same as one on the entire population - employed, self-employed, and unemployed; (3) is the same regression as regression one but controls for marital status, ethnicity, and number of children; (4) is the same as regression three on all, employed, self-employed and unemployed individuals. State×Year FE were added to the regression to absorb any unobserved outcome the changes in legislation might have had. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	(1) Employed only	(2) All individuals	(3) Employed only	(4) All individuals
Female x Access index	0.000966*** (0.000283)	0.00103*** (0.000278)	0.000926*** (0.000284)	0.000996*** (0.000279)
Female	-0.0131*** (0.000288)	-0.0131*** (0.000280)	-0.0135*** (0.000292)	-0.0137*** (0.000286)
Married			0.00672*** (0.000306)	0.00663*** (0.000297)
Minorities			-0.00396*** (0.000284)	-0.00328*** (0.000266)
Ln(#children+1)			0.0127*** (0.000846)	0.0106*** (0.000777)
Has children			-0.00719*** (0.000824)	-0.00548*** (0.000763)
Observations	2,632,393	2,754,593	2,615,054	2,736,922
R-squared	0.048	0.048	0.049	0.050
Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes
State×Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.*

Table I.19: **The coefficient on *abortion ratio* in various family structures - ACS data 2001-2017**

A table summarizing a replication of the analysis performed in Section 4.1 on various family structures. As detailed in Eq. 1, the variable *Entrepreneur* was regressed against *Abortion ratio*, a set of macro and micro level controls and state, year, age, and industry fixed effects on the entire target population (age 20-40, college educated women), on a subsample of unmarried women within this target population, and on a subsample of married women. The subsamples were then restricted to women with and without children. Each cell in the table below contains (from top to bottom): the relevant coefficient, its standard error, the number of observations in the subsample, the subsample's mean level of entrepreneurship, and a comparable measure of economic magnitude. Economic magnitude is calculated as a one standard deviation of the independent variable *Abortion ratio*, times its coefficient divided by the mean of the dependent variable *Entrepreneur*.

Variable:	Women Age 20-40		
<i>Abortion ratio</i>	Entire Sample	No children	Children
	0.0118** (0.00565)	0.0131** (0.00514)	0.0104 (0.0105)
Entire Sample	1,568,629 1.51% <b>5.86%</b>	823,304 1.07% <b>9.34%</b>	745,325 2.06% 3.76%
	0.0105* (0.00569)	0.0111* (0.00568)	0.00695 (0.0158)
Unmarried Women	646,459 0.94% <b>8.55%</b>	545,981 0.87% <b>9.81%</b>	100,211 1.33% 3.96%
	0.0124 (0.00836)	0.0168* (0.00904)	0.0106 (0.0116)
Married Women	922,437 1.98% 4.67%	277,323 1.49% <b>8.40%</b>	645,114 2.19% 3.59%

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.20: **The coefficient on the triple interaction *Female x Treated x Post* in various family structures - CPS data 1970-1980**

A table summarizing a replication of the analysis performed in Section 4.2.1 on various family structures. As detailed in Eq. 4, the variable *Entrepreneur* was regressed against the triple interaction *Female x Treated x Post*, all the double interactions and the variables themselves, a set of micro level controls and state, year, age, and industry fixed effects on the entire target population (age 20-40, college educated individuals), on a subsample of unmarried individuals within this target population, and on a subsample of married individuals. The subsamples were then restricted to individuals with and without children. Each cell in the table below contains (from top to bottom): the relevant coefficient, its standard error, the number of observations in the subsample, the rate of entrepreneurship in the relevant subsample in the pre-treatment period, and a comparable measure of economic magnitude. Economic magnitude is calculated as the coefficient of the triple interaction divided by the level of entrepreneurship in the pre-treatment period.

Variable:	Individuals Age 20-40		
<i>Female x Treated x Post</i>	Entire Sample	No children	Children
	0.0169*** (0.00496)	0.0149* (0.00853)	0.0138 (0.019)
Entire Sample	79,304 3.78% <b>45%</b>	42,946 2.34% <b>54%</b>	36,858 5.30% 26%
	0.0395*** (0.00917)	0.0323*** (0.0098)	0.332*** (0.105)
Unmarried Individuals	27,399 2.39% <b>166%</b>	25,669 2.25% <b>144%</b>	1,730 5.69% <b>583%</b>
	0.00216 (0.0116)	0.00497 (0.0146)	0.0021 (0.0148)
Married Individuals	51,905 4.47% 5%	17,277 2.49% 20%	34,628 5.29% 4%

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.21: **The coefficient on the *TRAP law treatment* variable in various family structures - CPS data 1977-2008**

A table summarizing a replication of the analysis performed in Section 4.2.2 on various family structures. As detailed in Eq. 8, the variable *Entrepreneur* was regressed against the treatment variable *TRAP law treatment*, a set of micro level controls and state, year, age, and industry fixed effects on the entire target population (age 20-40, college educated women), on a subsample of unmarried women within this target population, and on a subsample of married women. The subsamples were then restricted to individuals with and without children. Each cell in the table below contains the relevant coefficient, its standard error, the number of observations in the subsample, the rate of entrepreneurship in the control group, and a comparable measure of economic magnitude. Economic magnitude is calculated as the coefficient of the treatment variable divided by the level of entrepreneurship in the control group.

Variable:	Women Age 20-40		
<i>TRAP law treatment</i>	Entire Sample	No children	Children
	-0.00411*	-0.00247	-0.00608**
	(0.00211)	(0.00311)	(0.00285)
Entire Sample	170,170	92,262	77,908
	4.78%	3.39%	6.45%
	<b>-8.6%</b>	-7.3%	<b>-9.4%</b>
	-0.000469	0.000874	-0.00866
	(0.00293)	(0.00366)	(0.00981)
Unmarried Women	70,773	59,589	11,184
	3.13%	2.92%	4.49%
	-1.5%	0.3%	-19.3%
	-0.0062**	-0.00874**	-0.00513
	(0.00244)	(0.00402)	(0.00314)
Married Women	99,397	32,673	66,724
	5.92%	4.25%	6.71%
	<b>-10.5%</b>	<b>-20.6%</b>	-7.6%

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.22: **The coefficient on the interaction *Female* × *Access index* in various family structures - ACS data 2006-2017**

A table summarizing a replication of the analysis performed in Section 4.2.3 on various family structures. As detailed in Eq. 11, the variable *Entrepreneur* was regressed against the interaction, a set of micro and macro level controls and state, year, age, and industry fixed effects on the entire target population (age 20-40, college educated individuals), on a subsample of unmarried individuals within this target population, and on a subsample of married individuals. The subsamples were also restricted to individuals with and without children. Each cell in the table below, contains the relevant coefficient, its standard error, the number of observations in the subsample, the mean rate of entrepreneurship in the relevant subsample, and a comparable measure of economic magnitude. Economic magnitude is calculated as a one standard deviation of the interaction *Female* × *Access index*, times its coefficient divided by the mean of the dependent variable *Entrepreneur*.

Variable	Individuals Age 20-40		
	Entire Sample	No children	Children
<i>Female</i> × <i>Access index</i>	0.00100*** (0.000278)	0.000031 (0.000307)	0.00143*** (0.000472)
Entire Sample	2,736,922 2.27% <b>4.41%</b>	1,551,206 1.62% 0.19%	1,185,716 3.21% <b>4.46%</b>
Unmarried Individuals	-0.000254 (0.000345)	-0.000402 (0.000343)	-0.00117 (0.00153)
	1,198,115 1.47% -1.73%	1,071,284 1.42% -2.83%	126,831 1.87% -6.27%
Married Individuals	0.00171*** (0.000380)	0.00114** (0.000545)	0.00164*** (0.000485)
	1,538,807 3.00% <b>5.69%</b>	479,922 2.15% <b>5.30%</b>	1,058,885 3.40% <b>4.82%</b>

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.23: **Entrepreneurship and abortion ratios split by ethnicity - ACS data 2001-2017**

An LPM regression using the IPUMS ACS weighted database between the years 2001 and 2017. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed, incorporated, and in a nonfarm profession. The sample is restricted to individuals with college degrees. *Abortion ratio* are abortions as a percentage of pregnancies excluding fetal deaths/miscarriages. Regression: (1) looks at the entire population of women between the ages of 20 and 40 in the United States and controls for marital status, ethnicity, log number of children, a dummy variable of whether the individual has children in household, state GDP growth, state personal income growth, and the fractions of Republicans in the Senate; (2) limits the sample to white women; (3) limits the sample to black women; (4) limits the sample to all other ethnicities. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	(1) All	(2) White	(3) Black	(4) Other
Abortion ratio	0.0118** (0.00565)	0.0179** (0.00695)	0.000574 (0.0157)	0.00185 (0.0105)
Married	0.00634*** (0.000309)	0.00620*** (0.000369)	0.00531*** (0.00107)	0.00560*** (0.000736)
Minorities	-0.000519* (0.000312)			
Ln(#children+1)	0.00651*** (0.000816)	0.00715*** (0.000903)	0.000866 (0.00204)	0.00964*** (0.00229)
Has children	-0.00451*** (0.000810)	-0.00463*** (0.000909)	-0.00302 (0.00209)	-0.00695*** (0.00210)
State GDP growth	-0.00781 (0.0192)	-0.0124 (0.0226)	0.0607 (0.0538)	-0.0255 (0.0448)
Personal inc. growth	-0.00129 (0.0103)	-0.000554 (0.0122)	-0.0226 (0.0293)	0.00338 (0.0262)
Frac. republicans	-0.000487 (0.000768)	-0.000459 (0.000846)	0.00187 (0.00195)	-0.00305 (0.00194)
Observations	1,568,629	1,229,958	111,679	226,992
R-squared	0.037	0.039	0.038	0.040
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sample Mean	1.51%	1.59%	1.03%	1.44%
Economic magnitude	5.86%	8.44%	0.43%	0.95%

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .



Table I.24: **Difference-in-differences among employed individuals around roe v. wade split by ethnicity - CPS data 1970-1980**

A difference-in-differences analysis around the January 1973 Roe v. Wade court decision. The weighted subsample consists of employed and self-employed, college graduate, individuals, ages 20 to 40 representing the same population in the United States. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed in a nonfarm profession. Control states are states that legalized abortions in 1970: AK, CA, HI, NY, WA. Treated states are the rest of the states that legalized abortions following the court's decision in 1973. Control variables include marital status, and number of children. Column (1) consists the entire sample, column (2) only white individuals, column (3) only black, and column (4) all other ethnicities. The *Female X Treated X Post Roe* measures the marginal effect of the legalization of abortions on women in the seven years following the court's decision. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	(1) All	(2) White	(3) Black	(4) Other
Female x Treated x Post	0.0169*** (0.00496)	0.0152*** (0.00478)	0.0540** (0.0257)	-0.0138 (0.0419)
Female x Treated	0.00761 (0.0133)	0.0102 (0.0128)	-0.0504 (0.0315)	0.0417 (0.0375)
Female x Post	-0.0135*** (0.00315)	-0.0111*** (0.00224)	-0.0590*** (0.0195)	-0.0164 (0.0361)
Treat x Post	-0.00888** (0.00427)	-0.00824* (0.00420)	-0.0266 (0.0160)	0.00650 (0.0210)
Female	-0.0196* (0.0116)	-0.0224** (0.0111)	0.0424* (0.0250)	-0.0255 (0.0305)
Observations	79,304	72,937	4,076	2,291
R-squared	0.187	0.189	0.252	0.350
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table I.25: **Dynamic difference-in-differences among employed individuals - TRAP laws split by ethnicity - CPS data 1977-2008**

A dynamic difference-in-differences analysis. The left-hand side variable, *Entrepreneur*, is a dummy variable receiving one when an individual is self-employed in a nonfarm profession. The dummy variable *TRAP law treatment* turns into one once TRAP laws are enacted in each state. The weighted target group in column (1) consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate women. Column (2) is restricted to white women, column (3) to black, and column (4) to all other ethnicities. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Variables	(1) All	(2) White	(3) Black	(4) Other
TRAP law treatment	-0.00411* (0.00211)	-0.00509** (0.00222)	-0.00529 (0.00514)	0.00776 (0.0108)
Married	0.0155*** (0.00144)	0.0154*** (0.00172)	0.00893*** (0.00294)	0.0147** (0.00588)
Minorities	-0.0105*** (0.00301)			
Ln(#children+1)	0.0347*** (0.00362)	0.0349*** (0.00433)	0.0218*** (0.00647)	0.0524*** (0.0157)
Has children	-0.0154*** (0.00367)	-0.0130*** (0.00455)	-0.0230*** (0.00594)	-0.0354** (0.0140)
Observations	170,170	145,325	13,331	11,514
R-squared	0.230	0.238	0.240	0.212
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
state FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .*

Table I.26: **Entrepreneurship and weighted access index among employed and unemployed individuals with gender interaction split by ethnicity - ACS data 2006-2017**

A weighted least square regressions of a dummy variable equals to one when the individual is an entrepreneur against the interaction between a dummy variable equals one when the individual is a female multiplied by that year-state standardized “Access index”. *Access index* tracks state legislation that improves or weakens access to reproductive care. Higher index means better access. Regression (1) consists of all fertile (ages 20 to 40), college graduate, men and women. Regression (2) uses a subsample of white individuals; (3) is limited to black individuals; and (4) is limited to individuals from all other ethnicities. Standard errors are clustered at the state×year level.

Variables	(1) All	(2) White	(3) Black	(4) Other
Female x Access index	0.00100*** (0.000278)	0.000819** (0.000318)	-0.000676 (0.000822)	0.00245** (0.00118)
Female	-0.0137*** (0.000286)	-0.0147*** (0.000327)	-0.00926*** (0.000843)	-0.0101*** (0.000556)
Access index	0.00109* (0.000611)	0.00115* (0.000659)	0.000266 (0.00132)	0.000342 (0.000513)
Married	0.00662*** (0.000297)	0.00715*** (0.000346)	0.00635*** (0.000939)	0.00432*** (0.000628)
Minorities	-0.00328*** (0.000266)			
Ln(#children+1)	0.0106*** (0.000777)	0.0105*** (0.000912)	0.00508** (0.00216)	0.0132*** (0.00208)
Has children	-0.00546*** (0.000763)	-0.00493*** (0.000915)	-0.00409* (0.00214)	-0.00810*** (0.00191)
State GDP growth	-0.00185 (0.0187)	0.0112 (0.0201)	-0.0178 (0.0479)	-0.0626 (0.0398)
Personal inc. growth	-0.0184* (0.0102)	-0.0285** (0.0115)	0.0140 (0.0290)	0.0135 (0.0240)
Frac. republicans	-0.000378 (0.000881)	-0.000117 (0.000912)	-0.00351 (0.00250)	-0.00109 (0.00232)
Observations	2,736,922	2,116,006	176,025	444,891
R-squared	0.049	0.052	0.045	0.045
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .